

## Bob Schieffer Hosts CBS's "Face the Nation"

### [LIST OF SPEAKERS](#)

---

SCHIEFFER:

And good morning again. Well, you can agree with him or not, but you can always count on the New York mayor, Michael Bloomberg, to answer the questions, which is what he did in our wide- ranging interview. He vowed to continue his fight for better gun laws and defended his ban on big, sugary drinks. But we start with his thoughts on the sequester and the president's charm offensive.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BLOOMBERG:

Bob, you know, I think it was Winston Churchill that once said, "You can always depend on America to do the right thing after exhausting all other possibilities."

(LAUGHTER)

And my late mother used to tell me -- she said, "You know, the good old days were never the good old days." We've had a democracy for 235-odd years and it works in the end, and that's what's in important.

In terms of a charm offensive, look, the president's job is to lead Congress. And I find it fascinating people criticize him for taking people to dinner. He should be doing that every night. They criticized him for going and playing golf with people who he's got to deal with. He should be doing that every weekend. You always can work better with somebody that you have a chance to build a social relationship with.

Sequestering is here. It will go on for a while. It's not going to be the end of the world as we know it. And everybody was saying, "Oh, we're going to -- the worst-case scenario is exactly what we're going to implement." And now they're into the real world and they'll try to find ways to do more with less, and then hopefully Congress will come together and modify sequestering to cut things back where we can afford it and where we -- not where we can't.

And keep in mind, no program to reduce the deficit is -- makes any sense whatsoever unless you address the issue of entitlements, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest payment on the debt, which you can't touch, and defense spending. Everything else is tiny compared to that.

SCHIEFFER:

All right, let's talk a little bit about guns. You're in the forefront of this debate, that's for sure. It appears from what we're hearing from Capitol Hill right now, there's going to be -- it's not going to be possible to ban assault weapons, which was the purpose of a lot of people's projects when they started out on all this, but it does seem that they're making something headway on getting better background checks on the sale of these weapons and checks on people who are buying them.

Where do you see this going and where does it need to go?

BLOOMBERG:

The truth of the matter is only about 400 people a year get killed with assault weapons or high-capacity magazines. That is 400 too many, and they're all tragedies, but you compare that to handguns, pistols, this year, are going to kill 12,000 Americans. And 19,000 Americans are going to commit suicide with handguns. And there are 14 states that have background checks required for all sales.

Federal law says background checks when a gun dealer sells you a gun but no background checks if the sale is done over the Internet or at a gun show. Fourteen states have closed that loophole, and in those 14 states the suicide rate is half the national average and the number of women that get killed in domestic violence is something like 40 percent less than in other states.

So background checks do work. I think the FBI last year turned down something like 80,000 requests to buy a gun because people either were minors, had criminal records, substance abuse problems or mental problems. And that's what federal law prohibits gun dealers from selling to, those people, and that's exactly what we should expand.

And I'm optimistic that Congress will do something. We've done a poll, something like 22 states, and, I don't know, 50 congressional districts, and overwhelming, people -- 80 percent to 90 percent of the people want substantive background checks before people who shouldn't have guns can buy a gun. And we even ran an ad showing the results of those polls and giving people the names of their senators and congressmen so they can call up and make their views known to their elected officials.

SCHIEFFER:

Let me just ask you the obvious question. If people are overwhelmingly for this, why is it so hard to get the Congress to do it?

BLOOMBERG:

Because, up until now, it has only been the NRA that has been talking about guns to the public and to Congress. And I'm trying to level the playing field and bring out the facts.

The truth of the matter is the NRA itself, a few years ago, was in favor of background checks. For some reason -- and I don't understand it because it makes no sense -- they have changed. And in fact they should be out there arguing for the rights of gun owners, protecting the second amendment, but we all know that certain people should not have guns. You just don't want to give criminals guns. That has nothing to do with the second amendment. You don't want to give people who have mental problems guns that might kill themselves or kill somebody else. That makes some sense.

And up until now, it's only been the NRA. They've had the field to themselves. And what I'm trying to do is to explain to the public what the issues are and then let the public decide. And there are a lot of other people that want to join in this fight and give an alternative to the NRA.

It's simply a question of information. And we did that in Illinois a couple weeks ago, where we explained to the public the views of the different candidates when it comes to allowing guns to be purchased by kids and - and drug dealers. And then the public went to the polls and they voted, and they voted for somebody that -- who I've never met, but they voted for somebody who thinks that we should not allow those people that wouldn't responsibly be able to handle a gun to buy one. And they did not vote for the person that did.

SCHIEFFER:

I wanted to ask you about that race out in Chicago because you put resources into that. You came out for the person who was for stronger gun laws. And in this case, it worked. Can we expect to hear more of that sort of thing and more of that kind of support from you for other candidates around the country?

BLOOMBERG:

Well, I really think that things in Washington are going better than anybody is willing to step -- understands. The Judiciary Committee just took up gun legislation the other day. It starts the process. The federal government doesn't overnight do things, and probably shouldn't write laws that quickly. The president and vice president are committed here. There's an awful lot of momentum among both Republican and Democratic rural and urban and suburban congressmen and senators and red states and blue states to do something that will protect the public.

SCHIEFFER:

Because I want to ask you about sugary drinks, because your ban on these large sugary drinks goes into effect, I guess, next week in New York. And already we're seeing some people who are saying this is making it really hard on us, not necessarily people who sell those sugary sodas, but people like, well, Starbucks.

They don't know what to do about some of the coffees that they sell. What about all that?

BLOOMBERG:

Number one, that's ridiculous. They can figure out -- Starbucks knows how to market things, knows how to package things. They can change instantly when it's in their interest to do so.

This is in the country's interest. This year, for the first time in the history of the world, more people will die from too much food than from too little food. More people will die from the effects of obesity than from starvation. And we've got to do something about this. This is going to bankrupt the country. Our medical system cannot handle it. It -- being overweight is the first time it's gone from a rich person's disease to a poor person's disease. We've just got to do something.

And all we're doing in New York is reminding you that it's not in your interest to have too many empty calories. You can have some. If you want to have 32 ounces, just buy two 16-ounce cups. Take them back to your seat. If you want 64 ounces, take four cups back. But what's likely to happen here is you'll take one and probably not come back for the second. But it's totally your choice. We're not banning anything. It's called portion control. It's a typical way that companies use to -- and governments use to explain to people what's in their interest and what isn't. Every food manufacturer and soft drink manufacturer, they have portion control. What they're trying to do is to maximize their profits and what government is trying to do is inform that you if you're overweight and you have all these empty calorie and you keep eating that your health is going to suffer and you will live a not as healthy and a shorter life.

SCHIEFFER:

All right, well, Mr. Mayor we always enjoy talking to you and hope you come back to see us again thank you.

BLOOMBERG:

Bob, always appreciate the invitation, looking forward to it, thanks.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHIEFFER:

And joining us now to get the latest on the budget crisis here in Washington, democratic congressman Chris Van Hollen, and Ohio Republican Senator Rob Portman, two legislators that the president has reached out to.

I want to note that our -- we're under the limit here on how big these cups can be...

VAN HOLLEN:

Portion control.

SCHIEFFER:

Portion control right here.

You know the president -- the big talk around Washington is this so-called charm offensive. He has dinner with these Republican legislators. You were over at the White House with Paul Ryan, the head of the budget committee on the Republican side. Senator Portman, you have actually taken phone calls from the president in the past.

But I guess what's unusual here is that this is actually news, which kind of gives us an idea of the -- how wide the divide is. Did any -- is this doing any good, Senator Portman?

PORTMAN:

It's great. I mean, to build some trust is a good thing. But to be honest with you, Bob, what the president needs to do is reach out not just to Republicans but to Democrats and to ensure that he gives them the political cover to do frankly what most of them know needs to be done.

I won't speak for Chris, but having talked to him a lot about these issues, he gets it in terms of the need for us to deal with these very important but unsustainable entitlement programs.

SCHIEFFER:

Well, do you think that he has given up on dealing with the leadership, that he feels like he just can't get anything done with them, and so he's going to kind of go around them?

PORTMAN:

Well, I don't think he's going around them, but I think he's acknowledging what many presidents have in the past which is you do need to talk to the folks who the leadership are listening to.

The second thing he needs to do, Bob, is he needs to talk to the American people about the reality, using the

bully pulpit is incredibly important right now. We have to educate folks as to what the problem is. For instance, Social Security this year is in trouble. There's about an \$80 billion deficit. The payroll taxes don't pay for the benefits going out. That in Medicare, on average, a family gets about \$3 back for every \$1 you put in for premiums and payroll tax. And that's not understood right now.

So in order to do what we have to do in a relatively short period of time, because I think the window is pretty short here. I think it's by the end of this year, the president has a big role to play. Meeting with Republicans is fine, but I think it's more important to reach out to Democrats and let them know he has their back and reach out to the American people.

SCHIEFFER:

Well, that's kind of interesting, congressman. Here you have a Republican Senator saying what the president needs to do is get in touch with his own party, people in your party. Is he? And is there more he can do there?

VAN HOLLEN:

Well, sure he is. The president has been reaching out to Democrats. The complaint from our Republican colleagues in the past was that he was only reaching out to Democrats. So I think this is an important move forward.

The president had been meeting with Republican leaders all along. After all, he had Speaker Boehner for a long period of time in negotiations last December. And Speaker Boehner said he didn't want to meet one on one with the president any more. I mean, that is what the speaker said. So now the president is reaching out more broadly among Republicans, which I think is a good thing.

Ultimately, of course, in order for us to reach an agreement, everyone's got to be willing to compromise. And the president has indicated that he wants to -- he understands he needs to make more cuts. We've done \$1.5 trillion in cuts. He understands we have to do more. But he also recognizes you want to do it in ways that doesn't gut our investments in education and violate commits to seniors. You also need revenues. And ultimately our Republican colleagues are going to have to back off their position where they're saying you can't close one single tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the defense. You've got to take a balanced approach going forward.

So, more talk is good, but ultimately we need everybody to come together and compromise.

SCHIEFFER:

Let me just ask you this because you were both members of this so-called super committee back there that

was going to come together and you were going to be the ones who were going to work out something so we didn't have to go in to this sequestration. Were you ever close to a deal?

VAN HOLLEN:

Well what I can say, Bob, is I think everybody went into this discussion with the best of intentions, everybody got up to try and work hard every day to try to get a deal. There were moments when I think we thought maybe there would be a breakthrough.

Looking back, sort of in the rearview mirror, it's hard to see a moment where there was going to be a real breakthrough.

And, again, from my perspective, and again, obviously, people have different perceptions, it goes back to this fundamental disagreement. We support a balanced approach, meaning a mix of revenue, as well as cuts.

SCHIEFFER:

Was that your take, senator, because I've heard some people say, look, we had a deal and it just all fell apart.

PORTMAN:

Well, we came very close. And it was a balanced approach, and Republicans supported it. And Republicans still approach...

SCHIEFFER:

So what happened.

PORTMAN:

...a balanced approach. I mean, look, spending is the problem, there is no question about it. The Congressional Budget Office just told us again two weeks ago that if we don't do something on the spending side, there's no way that taxes at any level can catch it, because spending goes up so rapidly.

In fact, these important programs -- Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, they just told us they will double in size in the next 10 years, which is, of course, the main reason, along with interest on the debt, that you add another \$10 trillion to the budget deficit.

Revenue, on the other hand, actually goes up above its historic average by 2015, just a couple of years from now. And stays above its historic average. So taxes on the economy will actually be more than it has been since World War II as a percent of our economy, which is how economists like to look at it.

So we've got to deal with the spending side. That's what's critical. And if we don't do that, Bob, nothing else will matter.

SCHIEFFER:

Well, Senator Lindsey Graham said on this broadcast last week, he would support a grand bargain that would bring in new revenue from tax reform as long as it includes entitlement reform. Would you agree to that?

PORTMAN:

In the supercommittee, Republicans agreed to that. We had tax reforms, which helps to grow this economy, which is historically weak also, the weakest economic recovery since the Great Depression. Tax reform will help those folks who are on bottom rung of the economic ladder get up to the second and third rung, so that's needed.

It also does provide us the ability as Republicans to say, look, we're getting the growth out of the taxes and along with entitlement reform we would be willing to put some more revenue on the table. Again, in the supercommittee, we did that.

SCHIEFFER:

You did it.

PORTMAN:

But the problem right now is we don't see from the president any structural changes in this unsustainable course on entitlements. We see the request for more and more taxes at a time when we raised taxes \$620 billion on the American economy.

SCHIEFFER:

But what about that, congressman? I mean, aren't you going to have to do more on the entitlements than Democrats have suggested doing thus far?



VAN HOLLEN:

We are. And the president has proposed that. The difference is a difference in approach when it comes to Medicare. The Republican approach to date has been they want to deal with rising Medicare costs by transferring those extra costs on to the backs of seniors whereas the approach we took in Obamacare was change the incentives in Medicare to end overpayments to providers and we saved \$750 billion. And Paul Ryan just announced the other day that is going to include those savings in his budget, savings that he campaigned actively against.

So, yes. But we need to build on that approach, which doesn't pass the additional burden on Medicare beneficiaries whose median income is \$22,000. Which is why we said we need revenue as part of the plan to reduce those other costs.

SCHIEFFER:

All right. Well, I want to thank both of you for coming...

VAN HOLLEN:

Bob, thanks very much.

PORTMAN:

Thank you.

SCHIEFFER:

We'll be back in one minute with former Florida Governor Jeb Bush to talk about immigration.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER:

Former Governor Jeb Bush joins us from the Reagan Library in California now. He has a new book called "Immigration Wars." Governor we want to welcome you to the broadcast, your first appearance on "Face the Nation" so we're glad to have you.

Let me just start...

BUSH:

It's an honor to be with you, Bob.

SCHIEFFER:

Thank you very much. It's -- I want to start with the news here. For years you supported a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants. Now, apparently, according to your new book, you no longer support that. You support a path to legal residency in this country. Why have you changed?

BUSH:

Well, first of all, I -- I haven't changed. The book was written to try to create a blueprint for conservatives that were reluctant to embrace comprehensive reform, to give them, perhaps, a set of views that they could embrace. I support a path to legalization or citizenship so long as the path for people that have been waiting patiently is easier and costs less, the legal entrance to our country, than illegal entrance.

The worst thing that we could do is to pass a set of laws and have the exact same problem we had in the late 1980s, where there was not the enforcement and it was easier to come legally than illegally. So we need complete reform. And if that happens, the work being done in Washington right now -- the effort is to create - - to create this disincentive for legal immigration and incentive for illegal immigration -- then I would support a path to citizenship.

SCHIEFFER:

As you well know, what some people in your own party are saying is that -- that what you're really doing here is just laying out a more appealing position to those on the right side of your party and that that is why you have changed your position.

What do you say about that? Because, they say, you're thinking about running for president.

BUSH:

Yeah, see, that's the Washington world, the world of everything has to have a personal, political ambition motive. That's not the case. This book was written last year at a time when the tenor of the debate on immigration was dramatically different than it is today, and there were a lot of people that may have believed in comprehensive reform but hadn't been supportive of it, and I'm encouraged to see that that's not the case now, that people are moving in the direction of comprehensive reform.

Our book has many proposals in it, not just one. We deal with the DREAM Act, children of illegal immigrants. We -- we propose some pretty provocative things about expanding economic visas, modeled after the Canadian experience. We think that there ought to be a guest worker program. There's a lot to this book beyond just the one thing we're talking about right now.

SCHIEFFER:

Well, but this is what's getting the attention. I mean, Senator Graham, Republican, who is one of those working on immigration reform, when he heard of your proposals in this book, his first reaction was, "Well, that undercuts what we're trying to do here because we do support a path to citizenship for illegals."

BUSH:

So Senator Graham didn't have access to the book because this information was given to him the day before it was published. When -- when he had a chance to review the book and when I talked to him, he said, "We're on the same page."

SCHIEFFER:

Do your views coincide with those of Marco Rubio?

BUSH:

Absolutely. No, I think this is -- the fantastic thing is that there are now people willing to take a risk politically for sound, thoughtful policy on a complex issue. That's exactly what we need in Washington, D.C. And so I applaud what Senator Rubio's doing, the other members of the so-called gang of eight. They're making a major contribution.

And there's also efforts in the House of Representatives as well. This is a very encouraging time because, if we can get immigration right, imagine -- there's possibilities of -- of cats and dogs living with one another in other policy areas as well.

SCHIEFFER:

All right, well, we are -- we're going to take a short break here, Governor, and we'll be back to talk about some of that.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER:

I just finished the newly published third volume of "The Last Lion," William Manchester's epic biography of Winston Churchill. Manchester finished the research and organization of the book years ago but died early in the writing of it, and it was completed by his journalist friend Paul Reid. More than 1,000 pages, it is no light reading. It weighed in at six pounds on my bathroom scale, so heavy I put the book aside and finished it on my Kindle. But it was worth it.

I'm often asked who in history I would most like to interview, and my answer is Churchill. We owe him everything for recognizing the threat posed by Hitler and the courage that it took in the beginning to stand alone against him. This book reminds us to remember as well his iron will and ability to focus.

It recounts how once, in the middle of dictation, an ash from his cigar set his clothing on fire. A secretary saw the rising smoke and said, "Sir, you are on fire. May I put you out?"

The prime minister, not looking up, responded with nonchalance, "Yes, please do," and kept right on dictating.

In this age of Twitter, fancy phones, and multitasking, as we watch the self-important creatures of official Washington lunge from photo-op to photo-op as the rest of us trail in their wake, I wonder would it be better if we all slowed down and concentrated on one thing at a time? We've learned to multitask, but we're not getting much done.

Back in a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER:

Some of our stations are leaving us now. But for most of you, we will be back with a lot more of "Face the Nation," including more of our interview with Jeb Bush. He talks about whether or not he is thinking about running for president. And does he think Republicans should raise taxes to help cure the deficit?

Plus, we'll talk about what kind of Pope do Catholics want and what kind do they need? It's all ahead, so stay with us.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER:

Welcome back to Face the Nation. We're back with former Florida Governor Jeb Bush.

Governor, by every indicator that we use to judge these things, whether it's the state of the economy, the number of people who thought the country was headed in the wrong direction, the high unemployment figures, by every indicator that we normally use, President Obama should have lost the recent election. Yet, he didn't. Why do you think he won?

BUSH:

He's a very good campaigner, and his campaign was well organized, and they got their vote out. I mean, very basic math. He didn't win in a landslide. He won by three percentage points, but he won by waging a very effective campaign, and he won by in some ways dividing the country.

So Republicans, I think, need to learn from this, and to not just be reacting to what we think is wrong about the president's policies. We need to be advocating positive policies as well. And I think there is a growing awareness that that's the case.

SCHIEFFER:

What do you mean when you say he divide the country?

BUSH:

I think the basic part of his campaign was that those that were successful weren't paying their fair share, even though we have incredibly high taxes for high-income Americans. He -- I think he ran a campaign of them and us. And it was quite effective that somehow Republicans don't care about the large number of people.

And it's not true. But in order to win, I think Republicans need to offer a compelling alternative and have proposals on health care, have proposals on tax reform, on entitlement reform. The good news is that that is emerging.

SCHIEFFER:

But have you actually decided to get out here and explore whether you want to run or not? Are you thinking about it?

BUSH:

No, I'm not thinking about it. I've -- my big decision was to force myself not to think about it until it's time to -- the proper time to think about it, which is out into the future. We just had an election. Four years is a long way from now. And I think it's better to stay focused on the things that I'm doing now.

SCHIEFFER:

I want to ask you about the current negotiations going on here to find some kind of an agreement to erase the deficit or at least put us back on a sound financial footing. Would you encourage the Republicans to support some kind of increase in revenues if that's what it took to get an agreement?

BUSH:

I wouldn't -- I wouldn't say no, heck, no, and that's it. What I would do is advocate policies that would create high growth because the revenue collected by government when you're growing at 3.5 percent instead of 1.5 percent is exponentially more. And high growth over a sustained period of time by having a patriotic energy policy, bringing regulation to the 21st Century, immigration reform would be a good one, reforming our education system, tax policy -- all those things would yield, I think, far more revenue. That should be where there's the common ground.

And in return, there should be some give and take as it relates to entitlement reform. You could get to a place where our fiscal house would be in order if we achieved that.

The president has not been willing to discuss that but in the last week, he's begun to at least reach out to Republicans which is quite encouraging.

SCHIEFFER:

Do you think this is a good thing what he's doing here? I mean, can he actually get something done?

BUSH:

Yeah.

SCHIEFFER; You really think that's possible?

BUSH:

You know, there's-- there's two views on this. One is that he doesn't want to have an agreement, he wants to

gain control of the House, and then carry out his vision of how government should work in our country. And the other is that perhaps frustrated by the gridlock that he hasn't reached out enough, And that he's beginning to try to do that.

I don't know the president's motivations. I do know that if he reaches out and builds a dialogue where there's greater trust and there's a personal relationship, it matters. It's mattered for all presidents. And it would matter for him.

SCHIEFFER:

All right, well, it's very nice to have you, Governor Bush, and we hope you come see us again, thank you very much.

BUSH:

Take care, thank you.

SCHIEFFER:

And joining us now "Wall Street Journal" columnist Peggy Noonan and CBS News political director John Dickerson.

I just want to talk to the two of you. I mean, what's going on here, Peggy? I mean, for as long as I can remember, Jeb Bush was seen as -- by Hispanics, at least-- as the most enlightened person on immigration. He has always favored a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants. Now he write this book, and suddenly he's not for a path.

PEGGY NOONAN, WALL STREET JOURNAL; Yeah, it's a little confusing. Oddly enough, the book was written to make clear in a way what a Republican approach to immigration might fairly and generously and justly be. So I think it's a little -- a little problem that the-- that the change, if it is a change on the path to citizenship...

SCHIEFFER:

But this is not something by somebody who misspoke, who said, "oh, I said something I didn't mean to say." This is directly the opposite of what the position he had taken before, and then this week, as -- or last week, he was going around doing these interviews to promote his new book, he seemed to go back and say, "well, no, that's not really a change."

I think at best, John, he seems to have gotten off to kind of a slow start here if he is thinking about running for president, if that's what this is about.

JOHN DICKERSON, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT:

Crashing on the launchpad if this is a 2016 run. I think the fairest and most generous explanation what he was trying to do is hit a target. He was trying to say, "here's where the Republican Party is now. I'm going to inch them along here to a new place."

What happened in the time between when he wrote the book and today is the Republican Party jumped over his target. They have moved faster than Jeb Bush anticipated they would be. So his book is not a statement of clear principle, his book was an attempt to kind of move them along, but they moved faster than he did, which ends him up in this funny place.

What's your principle, Governor Bush? Is your principle a pathway to citizenship or is your pathway something else? And that's what people are having difficulty finding out. Is your book principle, or is it a statement of kind of a strategy about how to get a Republican Party to where you ultimately want them to do.

SCHIEFFER:

Peggy, let's talk a little about strategy around here, the president holding now famous dinners with people from other parties.

NOONAN:

And lunches.

SCHIEFFER:

...that used to not be news, if I may say so, but suddenly, it is.

NOONAN:

I know.

The -- well, this is the new Washington where it is sort of amazing if a president gets together with senators and congressmen.



That having been said, it's good it's happening. And I talked to a number of the -- at least the senators who were at dinner with the president the other night, and they felt impressed, they felt the meeting went well, everybody was forthcoming and candid, both sides. The president made clear certain constraints he was operating under, so did the Republicans.

I think the key -- or at least as I was told by the people I talked to -- the key here is will the president stay engaged and put the prestige of the presidency behind calling meetings, convening, keeping people talking, and also getting his arms around his own Democratic senators.

We tend to play this as a problem between the Democratic president and Republican senators. There's three problems -- Democratic president, Democrats in the Senate who need someone to help them along, and Republicans in the Senate who need to make their own decisions too.

I think if the president stays involved, this could be really promising.

SCHIEFFER:

What do you think, John?

DICKERSON:

I think he will stay involved. You talk to people in the White House. They say he will stay involved. There's an interesting thing we're watching here is the president is trying to figure out how much communication is good and useful communication.

On immigration reform, for example, Republicans are telling him, stay out of this, we don't need your help. Your help, you put your fingerprints on this kills the bipartisan effort.

So in some senses, reaching out to the other side is harmful to the ultimate goal.

In this case, though, what the White House has decided is a couple of things. They're out of the crisis mode of budgeting. They're back to a slower pace. The president can play a role here.

He hasn't had good relations with the leaders, either Mitch McConnell, the Republican leader in the Senate or John Boehner in the House. So he's now going around to the members directly. And the president feels that those members -- you heard Jeb Bush say the president never talked about entitlement reform. That's just dead wrong.

Now the president believes that these members don't get that message. What the real Republican message is, yes, he talked about entitlement reform, but it's tiny little stuff. It needs to be bigger. And the president

thinks if he's ultimately going to get this swap that you talked about with Rob Portman, this swap being revenue from tax changes for entitlement changes. If that deal is going to be made, the president is going to have to kind of make it one by one with Republican senators, hope to build something in the Senate, that then can pass the House if John Boehner lets it come up for a vote and lets it pass the House with a minority of Republicans which is a key threshold. That's the kind of dream scenario, but the White House is very realistic.

SCHIEFFER:

Just quickly to you, Peggy, do you really think there is a chance they can get something done here?

NOONAN:

Sure. It's a beautiful day in Washington. It's a gorgeous pre-Spring day. Your thoughts turn to optimism. I actually think it is possible. I think it would take a little bit of a change on the president's part. I think he has to build trust with Republicans who have occasionally come to question his good faith in negotiations. So there's a lot of work to do.

You know, normally, I'm a big fan of a president of the United States and Senators coming forward and speaking to the American people. This might be a great time for everybody to lower the volume, talk to each other, don't be out there trying to score point for your side.

SCHIEFFER:

All right. We are going to take a break here. And then we're going to come back and talk about who the next pope is going to be. And I hope our panel will be able to reveal to us just who that is.

(LAUGHTER)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER:

And we're back now with Peggy Noonan, and I have to say, John Dickerson's hair did not go to gray during the commercial there.

(LAUGHTER)

That's our old friend Carl Bernstein of Vanity Fair, who is with us; also, Sally Quinn, who writes about religion

for The Washington Post," and Greg Tobin, who writes books about the papacy. His latest is the "The Good Pope." Carl, of course, also wrote a book about the Pope.

Well, let's just start out, Sally. What's going to happen here?

QUINN:

Well, I wish I knew. But I will say one thing. The problem here with the papacy is that it is on the road to becoming irrelevant if they don't make some drastic changes. And so I don't know whether this conclave will be able to find somebody who can reform the church. But the problem they have is power.

Lord Acton said absolute -- I mean, "Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely." And I think one of the problems is that there has been too much centralized power and that the Pope has a pipeline to God, and then everybody else has to go through the Pope. I think that's got to change.

So I think, if these cardinals are smart, they will realize that they need to have some kind of reform and they will realize that it has to be decentralized.

SCHIEFFER:

Well, I'll tell you, there are a lot of Catholics, I must say, who would probably agree with that. American Catholics, in a recent poll, say -- 62 percent of them say that the next Pope should allow priests to marry. By a margin of 64 percent to 28 percent, Catholics feel the church should ease the ban on contraception. So, obviously, they do have in mind some kind of reforms.

Greg, do you think we're going to see any of that?

TOBIN:

I think that, over the next 10 to 20 years, we will see a couple of things, one, a continuation of the absorption within the church of the Second Vatican Council, which was "only," quote/unquote, 50 years ago. And the reforms that were put in place and the direction for the church has still yet to be, sort of, finally or fully decided upon.

Secondly, Catholics also -- and I think this is very important -- also look for a figure, and more than just a symbol but a real sense of unity within the church. I think that's very important for Catholics. Because "catholic," as meaning universal, is something that encompasses the entire world. And if you look at other religious denominations, especially in recent history, the past generation or so, there's been a lot of disintegration versus, I think, the need, the religious need among people like Catholics for a figure that will provide some unity for them.

SCHIEFFER:

Carl, what's your thought? How do you see this unfolding? Do you think it's going to take all week for them to come to a decision or is this something that...

BERNSTEIN:

I can't guess on that.

(CROSSTALK)

SCHIEFFER:

I mean, have they already got their minds made up when they go in there?

BERNSTEIN:

No, they don't have their minds made up. That's the history, that it takes some real discussion among them. But I think we've got to -- got to talk really very directly about what the problem is, and that is a male authority, unquestioned male authority in this institution that is out of touch with the rest of the world. And this male authority and problems of sex and gender and pedophile criminal priests -- according to American Catholic hierarchy, one out of 25 priests, I believe, has been believed to have some kind of problem with pedophile involvement. This is a terrible problem. And it comes from the institution itself covering up what this problem has been.

I would hope that, like in the time of John XXIII, who you wrote about, Greg, that the next Pope will be moved by the Holy Spirit, as they say in the conclave, to convene a Vatican III to look at the church in the modern world, as was -- happened -- as happened in Vatican II, and confront the relationship of the church to questions of sex, gender, male priesthood. It's not part of the theology itself. It's a latter-day invention. It's not part of Christ's Gospels.

This is a great institution. Its -- Catholic social teachings, one of the great contributions to the world. The Catholic Church educates more people, cares for more sick people than any institution in the world, does it probably better than any institution in the world, and it's got this great mission that's been undermined.

And until the church can deal with what's undermining it in a basic way without putting a pretty wrapper around it, like Cardinal Dolan was talking about here last week -- it's more than a wrapper that's needed. It's something basic.

SCHIEFFER:

Peggy, are you -- you're Catholic, right?

NOONAN:

I am.

SCHIEFFER:

And -- and how -- what are you-- what do you as a Catholic want to see here?

NOONAN:

Well, let me say, first of all, one of the things Catholics say to each other when they look at who's in the church is, "Wow, here comes everybody." Catholicism is 1.2 billion people all over the world. There's the church in Africa, the church in the West. It is varied. It is extraordinary. It is bubbling. It is ever- evolving. So that's one thing.

On the American Catholic polling that you mentioned, it is totally true that there's this great bubbling of liberal positions on what we call the social issues. At the same time, a poll came out this week that said 77 percent of American Catholics think Pope Benedict did a great job and he was a great Pope. Now, he is at the opposite from what they say they're for.

So there's a great deal of, let me just say, bubbling because I can't think of another word. But there's extraordinary variety and the ability to accept tension and disagreement within the church. What would I love to see? I would love to see a Pope who comes forward, who is joyous anyway, in spite of the condition of the world and in spite of the condition of the church, someone who doesn't have a sad, furrowed-brow look but is actually reacting to the world with a look of pleasure and a smile.

I think he has two impossible but necessary tasks that must be done. The first is showing that the church has turned the corner on the scandals. The second is bringing the message of Christ, the fundamental basic message of Christ, to the post-Christian West and to the rising nations of the South and of the East. Those are two big, huge jobs. It means stay home and clean house but go outside and bring Jesus. That's really hard. But I think that's what he has to do.

SCHIEFFER:

Even in matters like this, we always look for the hometown angle.

(LAUGHTER)

Greg, do you think there is any chance that an American could be named Pope? Because we've always been told, those of us who look at this from the outside, that there's no way they're going to pick somebody from a superpower, that just, politically, that that just doesn't work.

TOBIN:

I think it's an infinitesimal chance. I think no one in history has had as good a chance as Cardinal Dolan because he is such an outsized personality. They all know him and respect him. He has made such an impression from the very beginning when he received his red hat just a year ago. And I think that's a factor that will enter into their decision-making as well.

They tend to go toward fresher faces, people who have entered the College of Cardinals later than someone who has been in forever. The exception that proves that rule, of course, was Benedict, Cardinal Ratzinger, last time out, because he had been the -- risen to the deanship of the College of Cardinals.

But as far as an American goes, I would be the most surprised person in the world...

SCHIEFFER:

What about someone from, say, a Third World country? Because that's where most Catholics are now.

QUINN:

Well, Bob, it's going to have to be somebody who can get in and clean up the mess. And I think that that's one of the reasons that Ratzinger stepped down is because it was just -- the corruption, you know, financial and sexual corruption, was just overwhelming.

But the problem they're going to face is they might choose a cardinal who's got an unfortunate history that they don't know about. I mean, every day somebody is coming out, Cardinal O'Brien, Cardinal Mahoney-- every day someone is coming out with a history.

The other thing is that the church is farther and farther away from what, as Peggy said, what Jesus originally intended. Jesus said whoever boosts himself up will be lowered and whoever lowers themselves down will be boosted up, that is not exactly the description of a pope. And so I think the whole issue is what does the papacy mean to begin with?

SCHIEFFER:

You know, you raise an interesting point. There may be something in the -- I mean, you know, most jobs in modern society, they run a background check on them. I mean, we're talking about gun control here, getting background checks.

BERNSTEIN:

That hasn't worked. it doesn't work...

SCHIEFFER:

Do they, Peggy -- do they -- and I do not mean this to be disrespectful in any way. I'm a great respecter of the Catholic Church.

(LAUGHTER)

NOONAN:

Look, it is a divine and yet profoundly human institution, the Vatican.

Sally, you quote Jesus Christ well, but remember, he said to Saint Peter, before he was called Saint Peter, on this rock I will build my church and he even the fires of hell will not prevail against it. Sometimes the cardinals get a little frustrating because they act like oh, good, it doesn't matter what we do, it will always continue. I don't think that's probably the correct message to have been taken out of that, but the church has been around for a long time. It will be around for a long time.

May I say I think an American is possible, a little bit, because the thing that used to keep an American cardinal from being picked was that America was a super power. In Europe, in Italy, they don't see us as quite the super power we were. Oddly enough, that problem gives a little boost to the American cardinals.

SCHIEFFER:

So if it is an American, this will be-- someone will write a book about the decline of the west.

BERNSTEIN:

Well, there's another possibility and that's...

SCHIEFFER:

Well, they can write that one way.

BERNSTEIN:

There's a North American. There's a cardinal in Canada...

NOONAN:

Ouellet.

BERNSTEIN:

Ouellet both Dolan and Ouellet went to the North American college in Rome. He's a possibility. The real question, though, is as the world watches this conclave, they are going to see in a see in a different context than perhaps eight years ago or when John Paul II became pope, this 100-and-some males gathering together to choose another male to preside over with absolute authority and 120 other males under him, the world's 1.2 billion Catholics.

This is -- it seems to me this is going to be on a world stage as an anomaly that has never quite been regarded as such an anomaly before.

QUINN:

It's on the way to irrelevancy if they don't start including women, and certainly people of other color and ultimately, homosexuals.

And so I mean, they're all against homosexuality, even though so many priests are gay, that it...

SCHIEFFER:

Now you can't say that as a fact. I mean...

BERNSTEIN:

Well, if you have friends in the priesthood, as I do, friends in the priesthood will tell you that they have other



gay friends in the priesthood.

SCHIEFFER:

We'll have to leave this for another day.

NOONAN:

We are roaming far afield.

(CROSSTALK)

NOONAN:

We've gone very far afield yeah...

QUINN:

But, but...

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER:

We want to take note that the CBS Radio world news roundup, America's longest running news broadcast, celebrate its 75th anniversary this week.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

ANNOUNCER:

Tonight, the world trembles...

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SCHIEFFER:

The series debuted on March 13, 1938, the day of the Nazi invasion of Austria. And it was on that broadcast that Edward R. Murrow filed his first live report for CBS News. Back in a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER:

And that is it for us today. We'll be back next week with the chairman of the House budget committee, Paul Ryan. We'll see you there.

CQ Transcriptions, March 10, 2013

---

## List of Speakers

BOB SCHIEFFER, HOST

MAYOR MICHAEL BLOOMBERG, I-NEW YORK CITY

FORMER GOV. JEB BUSH, R-FLA.

REP. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, D-MD.

SEN. ROB PORTMAN, R-OHIO

Source: **CQ Transcriptions**

*All materials herein are protected by United States copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, published or broadcast without the prior written permission of CQ Transcriptions. You may not alter or remove any trademark, copyright or other notice from copies of the content.*

© 2013 CQ Roll Call All Rights Reserved.